



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/552,879	04/20/2000	John Carnahan	47004.000056	5010

21967 7590 02/10/2005

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

CHENCINSKI, SIEGFRIED E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3628

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

N

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/552,879

Applicant(s)

CARNAHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Siegfried E. Chencinski

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1 - 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being disclosed by Levine et al. (US Patent 6,233,566 B1, hereafter Levine) in view of Kurtzman II et al. (US Patent 6,144,944, hereafter Kurtzman).

Re. Claims 1 & 11, Levine discloses a system and method for multivariable comparison of financial information, comprising:

a client interface to a user operative to receive search information, the search information comprising user-selected quantitative search criteria; and a search interface, communicating with the client interface, the search interface operative to interrogate at least one network-enabled information source according to the search information (Col. 5, lines 55-56; Col. 6, lines 34-37, 52-53; Col. 21, lines 24-33; certain criteria – Col. 8, lines 4-6; user selected quantitative criteria – Col. 14, ll. 54-58. Levine does not explicitly disclose the use of weightable search information comprising user-selected quantitative search criteria and user-selected weighting criteria. However, an example in the prior art of the use of the technique of weightable search information comprising user-selected quantitative search criteria and user-selected weighting criteria is Kurtzman (Efficiently Selecting and Providing Information). Kurtzman states that “a user of the ad server 100 can adjust the weightings of a particular engine such that that engine gives advertisements of a slightly higher priority. Additionally, the user can cause the affinity of a particular advertisement to be increased or decreased by a greater amount by a specific engine. (Col. 7, ll. 5-10). Consequently, the weighting criteria used in the information searches in applicant’s invention would have been an

Art Unit: 3628

obvious technique for an ordinary practitioner of the art to use at the time of applicant's invention. The motivation for the ordinary practitioner for applying the ubiquitous technique of weightable searching with the teachings of Levine is to facilitate online information access to users who seek information about financial products which can be purchased in some manner, such as stocks, bonds or mutual funds (Col. 5, ll. 42-52).

Claims 2 & 12, Levine discloses a system and method wherein the client interface comprises a communications link for transmitting the weightable search information to a transaction server and transmitting the search results to the user (Col. 28, lines 27-42).

Claims 3 & 13, Levine discloses a system and method wherein the client interface comprises a graphical user interface for displaying at least one of the weightable search information, the search results, and graphical coding objects associated with the search results (Col. 6, lines 52-53, Fig's 7-14).

Claims 4 & 14, Levine discloses a system and method wherein the client interface comprises a network-enabled connection to a client workstation (Col. 28, lines 27-42).

Claims 5 & 15, Levine discloses a system and method wherein the network-enabled connection comprises an Internet connection (Col. 6, lines 34-38, Fig's 2A & 2B).

Claims 6 & 16, Levine discloses a system and method wherein the weightable search information comprises multivariable financial information (Col. 22, lines 54-56; Col. 26, lines 8-9).

Claims 7 & 17, Levine discloses a system and method wherein the weightable search information comprises weighting information to be applied to the multivariable financial information to generate a composite results score (Col. 2, lines 38-45).

Claims 8 & 18, Levine discloses a system and method wherein the weightable search information is modifiable to be applied to the search results (Beginning a new search using modified criteria is an inherent capability of Levine).

Claims 9 & 19, Levine discloses a system and method wherein the search interface comprises a connection to a relational database (Col. 16, line 48; Col. 27, line 43).

Claims 10 & 20, Levine discloses a system and method wherein the client interface comprises at least one of keyboard input, voice input, touch pad input, voice output, pointing device input, speech input, biometric input, and graphical output at the client

Art Unit: 3628

workstation (Client interface devices are inherent components of Levine's system and method).

2. Claims 21, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30 & 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being disclosed by Levine in view of Kurtzman and Reese (US Patent 6,370,516 B1).

Re. Claims 21 & 28, Levine discloses a system for multivariable comparison of financial information, comprising:

- a client interface to a user operative to receive search information, the search information comprising user-selected quantitative search criteria; and a search interface, communicating with the client interface, the search interface operative to interrogate at least one network-enabled information source according to the search information to generate search results (The client interface is a necessary component of any computer system which is capable of connecting a client user to another party through any network, including the internet or world wide web. Levine teaches such connections – Col. 1, ll. 116-20, 29-30; col. 5, ll. 41-52, 55-57; Col. 6, ll. 52-53);
- wherein the financial information comprises a plurality of investment funds, each having multiple quantitative investment fund variables associated therewith (It would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of Applicant's invention that financial information includes information about investment funds); and
- the search interface is operative to compare the quantitative investment fund variables with the user-selected quantitative search criteria and the user-selected weighting criteria to generate search results comprising investment funds (Comparing quantitative investment fund variables is taught in Col. 8, ll. 2-9, Col. 13, ll. 60-63; Col. 14, ll. 54-58).

Levine does not explicitly disclose

- a client interface to a user operative to receive weightable search information, the weightable search information comprising user-selected quantitative search

criteria and user-selected weighting criteria, the weighting criteria reflecting user-defined levels of importance for one or more of the quantitative search criteria; and a search interface, communicating with the client interface, the search interface operative to interrogate at least one network-enabled information source according to the weightable search information to generate search results;

- the generation of search results that at least partially satisfy the user-selected quantitative search criteria and user-selected weighting criteria.

However, per the obviousness rejection logic of claim 1 (*supra*), Kurtzman disclose the broad use of weighting criteria in information searches. As such, information search using weightable search criteria would have been an obvious technique to combine with Levine's teaching to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of applicant's invention.

Further, Reese discloses search results that at least partially satisfy the user-selected quantitative search criteria and user-selected weighting criteria (Col. 23, ll. 35-37). Reese's disclosure is more sophisticated than Applicant's in this criterion, which all the more presents an ordinary practitioner options and suggestions for producing simpler search results which give comparative search results of investments which do not fully meet the search criteria. Therefor, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to have combined the art of Levine, Kurtzman with the art of Reese for the purpose of permitting the evaluation of degrees of fit to one's investment search criteria for the purpose of saving a user's time through a highly automated search tool capable of producing search results which partially satisfy a user's search and weighting criteria (Reese, Col. 1, ll. 59-65).

Re. Claims 22 & 29, Levine does not explicitly disclose financial information relating to mutual funds. However, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of Applicant's invention to understand that one or more investment funds can comprise one or more mutual funds, since mutual funds are financial investment funds.

Re. Claims 23 & 30, Levine discloses a system and method comprising a results interface operative to display the search results to the user (Col. 6, ll. 52-53; Fig's 7-14).

Re. Claims 27 & 34, Levine, Kurtzman, disclose a system and method wherein the search interface is operative to compare the quantitative investment fund variables with the user-selected quantitative search criteria and the user-selected weighting criteria to generate a first set of search results comprising investment funds that satisfy all of the user-selected quantitative search criteria (See the rejection of claim 1). Further, Reese discloses a system and method for producing a set of search results that do not satisfy all of the user defined quantitative search criteria, but satisfy at least a portion of the user-selected weighting criteria (See the rejection of claim 21, element (d)). It would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to have combined the art of Levine and Kurtzman with the art of Reese for the purpose of saving a user's time through a highly automated search tool capable of producing search results which produce search results which can deliver exact matches for the user's search criteria as well as search results which only partially satisfy a user's search and weighting criteria in order to save a user search and evaluation time (Reese, Col. 1, ll. 59-65).

3. Claims 24 & 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being disclosed by Levine in view of Kurtzman and Reese as applied to claims 23 & 30 above, and further in view of O'Shaughnessy (US Patent 6,317,726 B1).

Re. Claims 24 & 31, Levine discloses a system and method wherein the results interface comprises a graphical user interface operative to display the one or more investment (Col. 6, ll. 52-53; Fig's 7-14). None of Levine, Kurtzman and Reese explicitly disclose the display of the one or more investment funds in a sortable list. However, O'Shaughnessy discloses the display the one or more investment funds in a sortable list (Col. 18, ll. 42-46, 50-62). Therefor, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to have combined the art of Levine, Kurtzman and Reese with the art of O'Shaughnessy for the purpose of permitting the evaluation of search results in various sortable sequences in order to help reduce the complexity of the evaluation of investment information through a rule-based

presentation available through automated sorting schemes to aid in investment decision making (O'Shaughnessy, Col. 1, ll. 45-51).

4. Claims 25, 26, 32 & 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being disclosed by Levine in view of Kurtzman and Reese as applied to claims 23 & 30 above, and further in view of Hambrecht et al. (US Patent 6,629,082 B1, hereafter Hambrecht).

Re. Claims 25, 26, 32 & 33, Levine discloses a system and method. None of Levine, Kurtzman and Reese explicitly disclose a results interface operative to receive requests for a prospectus or for an application for one or more of the one or more mutual funds. However, Hambrecht discloses a hot link to an investment prospectus and to an investment application for a new issue of a financial security (Col. 9, ll. 7-17; Col. 10, l. 31 – Col. 11, l. 10). It would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to have adapted the hot links tool for ordering information to a web site offering information on financial investments. It would therefore have been obvious to such ordinary practitioner to combine the art of Levine, Kurtzman and Reese with the art of Hambrecht for the purpose of offering a hot link attached to a financial information search web site's results interface for receiving requests for investment information such as a prospectus of a financial investment, including a mutual fund, and for ordering an application to invest in one or more financial securities, including mutual funds.

5. Claims 35 - 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being disclosed by Levine in view of Kurtzman, and further in view of Chang (US Patent 5,848,400).

Re. Claim 35, Levine discloses a system for multivariable comparison of financial information, comprising:

- a client interface to a user operative to (Col. 28, ll. 27-42; Fig's 7-14);
- receive a selection from a plurality of predetermined profiles, wherein each of the predetermined profiles comprises predetermined quantitative search information (Predetermined Profiles - Col. 13, ll. 60-63; Col. 15, ll. 54-55);

Art Unit: 3628

- create a custom profile by receiving information (Creating a custom profile - Col. 14, ll. 54-58; Col. 15, ll. 54-55);
- receive a user selection between the first client interface and the second client interface (Col. 28, ll. 27-42; Fig's 7-14);
- a search interface, communicating with the client interface, the search interface operative to interrogate at least one network-enabled information source according to at least one of the plurality of predetermined profiles and the custom profile to generate search results (Fig's 7-14); and
- a results interface operative to display the results to the user (Fig's 7-14, 18, 19).

Levine does not explicitly describe

- weightable search information, the weightable search information comprising user-selected quantitative search criteria and user-selected weighting criteria, the weighting criteria reflecting user-defined levels of importance for one or more of the quantitative search criteria; and
- a first, second and third interface. However,

However, per the obviousness rejection logic of claim 1 (*supra*), Kurtzman disclose the broad use of weighting criteria in information searches. As such, information search using weightable search criteria would have been an obvious technique to combine with Levine's teaching to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of applicant's invention. Further, Chang's disclosure makes use of a numbering scheme as part of describing the role of interfaces in a financial transaction system (Abstract, ll. 11-19). It would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to have combined the art of Levine, Kurtzman with the art of Chang for the purpose of identifying a plurality of client interfaces in order to more quickly and easily complete an evaluation of investment options from a remote location through an automated computer network (Chang, Col. 1, ll. 49-54).

Re. Claim 36, Levine discloses a system wherein each of the predetermined profiles further comprises predetermined weighting criteria (Col. 22, ll. 54-66; Col. 26, ll. 5-9).

Art Unit: 3628

Re. Claim 37, neither Levine nor Kurtzman or Chang explicitly disclose financial information relating to mutual funds. However, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of Applicant's invention to understand that one or more investment funds can comprise one or more mutual funds, since mutual funds are financial investment funds. Consequently, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Levine, Kurtzman and Chang with this common understanding by the ordinary practitioner at the time of Applicant's invention in order to enable a user to more productively search mutual fund information for the user's purposes (Levine, Col. 5, ll. 42-52).

6. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being disclosed by Levine in view of Kurtzman and Chang as applied to claim 37 above, and further in view of O'Shaughnessy.

Re. Claim 38, Levine discloses a system wherein the results interface comprises a graphical user interface operative to display one or more of the plurality of mutual funds (Col. 6, ll. 52-53; Fig's 7-14; mutual funds – see claim 37). However, none of Levine, Kurtzman and Chang explicitly disclose the display of the one or more mutual funds in a sortable list. However, O'Shaughnessy discloses the display of one or more investment funds in a sortable list (Col. 18, ll. 42-46, 50-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to have combined the art of Levine, Kurtzman and Chang with the art of O'Shaughnessy for the purpose of permitting the evaluation of search results in various sortable sequences for the purpose and motive of reducing the complexity of the evaluation of mutual fund investment information through a rule-based presentation available through automated sorting schemes to aid in investment decision making (O'Shaughnessy, Col. 1, ll. 45-51).

7. Claims 39 & 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being disclosed by Levine in view of Kurtzman and Chang as applied to claim 37 above, and further in view of Hambrecht.

Re. Claims 39 & 40, none of Levine, Kurtzman and Chang explicitly disclose a system wherein the results interface is operative to receive requests for a prospectus and/or an application for one or more of the plurality of mutual funds. However, Hambrecht et al. disclose a hot link to an investment prospectus and to an investment application for a new issue of a financial security (Col. 9, ll. 7-17; Col. 10, l. 31 – Col. 11, l. 10). It would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to have adapted the hot links tool for ordering information to a web site offering information on financial investments. It would therefor have been obvious to such ordinary practitioner to combine the art of Levine, Kurtzman and Chang with the art of Hambrecht for the purpose of offering a hot link attached to a financial information search web site's results interface for receiving requests for investment information such as a prospectus of a financial investment, including a mutual fund, and for ordering an application to invest in one or more financial securities, including mutual funds. One motivation for the ordinary practitioner's making this combination would have been to facilitate wider dissemination of investment information which would militate toward putting a greater number of prospective investors on a more equal footing in bidding to buy shares in financial instruments (Hambrecht, Col. 1, ll. 47-52).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed October 29, 2004 have been fully considered but they either not persuasive or they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

ARGUMENT A: Re. claims 1-20.

a) "Levine *fails* to indicate that a user can apply user-defined *weighting* criteria (e.g., rankings) to these search criteria to indicate *the relative importance of each variable to the user*, as provided by the present invention (p. 4, ll. 20-22).

b) "The Examiner apparently alleging that "[t]he weighting criteria within the context of applicant's invention are more flexible than Levine's, but would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of applicant's invention." ... Examiner is taking "official notice" of this allegedly obvious modification" (p. 5, ll. 13-24).

Art Unit: 3628

c) "... there is no basis for alleging that it would be known to modify Levine, which illustrates providing weighted average *results*, to instead have user-defined weightable *search* information in which the user selects quantitative criteria then applies user-selected weighting criteria reflecting the user's own subjective level of importance on each of the quantitative criteria (p. 6, ll. 10-15)".

RESPONSE: Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

ARGUMENT B: Re. claims 21-34.

a) "... claims 21-34 recite a system and method having a "weightable search information" feature that is substantially the same as in claim 1. Reese, Shaughnessy and Hambrecht do not correct this deficiency" (p. 7, ll. 14-18).

b) "the combination of references (Levine with Reese) is improper" (specifically p. 8. l. 2; generally - p. 7, l. 21 - p. 9, l. 7).

RESPONSE:

a) Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

b) Reese, Shaughnessy and Hambrecht are not used as prior to document "weightable search information".

b) The last paragraph of MPEP section 2143.02 deals with "DISCLOSURES THAT TEACH AWAY FROM THE CLAIMS". The illustration of this concept clearly demonstrates that the "teaching away" concept is based on logical common sense per *W.L. Gore & Associates v. Garlock, Inc.* This involves a teaching of "stretching said (unsintered) PTFE at a 10% per second rate to more than five times the original length. A reference teaching rapid stretching of conventional plastic polypropylene with reduced crystallinity combined with a reference teaching stretching unsintered PTFE, would not have suggested rapid stretching of highly crystalline PTFE, in light of the disclosures in the art that teach away from the invention, i.e., that the conventional polypropylene should have reduced crystallinity before stretching, and that PTFE should be stretched slowly". This court illustration demonstrates that the "teaching away"

Art Unit: 3628

doctrine has limited, narrow technical validity of a common sense variety. In this case, the alleged teaching away is technically unrelated to the section of Reese cited in Applicant's argument. The method step of "The scorecard variable maintains a count of how many criteria have been satisfied within the Knowledge Base being processed" in Col. 23, ll. 35-37 used by the examiner from Reese is an independent method concept which is freely applicable in the Levine art in the comparison of financial products in a search because it is a specific, narrow technique with which an ordinary practitioner of the art would have found it obvious to modify the Levine teaching for the purpose of Applicant's invention. Such a practitioner would not have been confused by the remainder of the teachings and the various problems Reese discusses and overcomes with various elements of his teaching.

ARGUMENT C: Re. claims 35-40.

"The primary issue with respect to this rejection is whether the cited references render obvious the feature of "weightable search information ... (a) feature that is substantially the same as recited in claim 1. Chang, O'Shaughnessy and Hambrecht do not correct this deficiency" (p. 9, ll. 16-25).

RESPONSE:

- a) Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20, the Levine reference and weightable search information have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- b) Chang, O'Shaughnessy and Hambrecht are not used as prior to document "weightable search information" in the rejections of claims 35-40.

Conclusion

9. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Ettl et al. (US Patent 6,078,900),

Kramer et al. (US Patent 6,327,574 B1),

Art Unit: 3628

Khedbar et al. (US Patent 6,609,118 B1),

Munsil et al., US Patent 6,836,763 B1),

Khavakhat et al. (US PG Publication 2003/0028319 A1, 6,487,497, 6,298,303, 6,192,314 B), and

Satomi et al. (US PG Publication 2003/0208483 A1).

This sampling of applications of the weightable search input technique in various areas of commerce demonstrates that this art was indeed well known prior art at the time of Applicant's invention, even in the application of computer systems and methods for a variety of commercial applications, including in financially oriented weightable criteria searches.

10. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Siegfried Chencinski whose telephone number is 703-305-6199. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 9am to 6pm. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough, can be reached on 703- 308-0505.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington D.C. 20231

Art Unit: 3628

or faxed to:

(703)872-9326 *[Before Final communications, labeled "Box BF"]*


(703)872-9327 *[After Final communications, labeled "Box AF"]*

(703) 872-9325 *[Customer Service]*

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, 7th floor receptionist.

SEC

February 7, 2005


HYUNG SOUH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600